



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the debt has been placed in judgment in a suit revived against the executor. The numerous authorities on the question of garnishment of executors or administrators are reviewed in a note to this case. See *White v. Coleman*, 31 Gratt. 784.

TRADEMARK—GEOGRAPHICAL NAME—“POCAHONTAS COAL.”—The case of *Coffman v. Castner* (U. S. Circ. Ct. App.), reported in full in 4 Va. Law Reg. 150, in which it was held that the word “Pocahontas,” as applied to coal from the famous Pocahontas coal section of Virginia, was a geographical term, and could not be appropriated as a trademark, as against the owners of any coal mines in that section, has been affirmed on appeal by the Supreme Court of the United States. 20 Sup. Ct. 842.

FRAUD—CONSPIRACY BETWEEN DEBTOR AND OTHER PERSONS TO DEFRAUD GENERAL CREDITOR.—The right of a general creditor to maintain an action on the case for conspiracy of the debtor and other persons to dispose of the debtor's property fraudulently, and defeat his claim is denied in *Field v. Siegel* (Wis.), 47 L. R. A. 433, if there was no fraud in the creation of the debt. With this case is a note reviewing the authorities on the right of action by a general creditor for damages against a third party on account of fraud in disposing of the debtor's property or preventing the collection of the claim.

NEGLIGENCE—INJURIES CAUSED BY FRIGHT.—A recovery for sickness due to the purely internal operation of fright caused by a negligent act is denied in *Smith v. Postal Teleg. Cable Co.* (Mass.), 47 L. R. A. 323, even if the negligence was gross and the party in fault ought to have known that the result would follow his act.

But, on the other hand, physical injury resulting from fright or other mental shock caused by wrongful act or omission is held, in *Gulf C. & S. F. R. Co. v. Hayter* (Tex.), 47 L. R. A. 325, to be sufficient to sustain a recovery of damages, if the negligence or wrong was the proximate cause of the injury and the injury ought, in the light of all the circumstances, to have been foreseen as a natural or probable consequence thereof.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—STATUTE PROHIBITING ACTION IN FOREIGN STATE TO SUBJECT WAGES OF LABORERS.—In the case of *In re Flukes*, 57 S. W. 545, it is held by the Supreme Court of Missouri that a State statute prohibiting any person or corporation from sending any note account or other *chase in action* out of the State for the purpose of causing suit to be instituted thereon in a foreign jurisdiction against a citizen of the State, and subjecting the wages of such citizen to the payment of a judgment thereon by garnishment served upon any person or corporation subject to the jurisdiction of the courts of Missouri, is unconstitutional. The court places the unconstitutionality of the statute on several grounds: (1) That in taking away the right to sue, which is one of the essential attributes of property, the creditor is deprived of his property without due process of law. (2) That the statute infringes article 4, sec. 2 of the Federal Constitution providing that citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges of citizens in the several States. (3) That it deprives the creditor of equal protection of the